

1 Mark A. Feller (SBN 319789)  
2 [mark.feller@morganlewis.com](mailto:mark.feller@morganlewis.com)  
3 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP**  
4 One Market, Spear Street Tower  
5 San Francisco, CA 94105-1596  
6 Tel: 415.442.1000

7 Melissa Hill (*pro hac vice*)  
8 [melissa.hill@morganlewis.com](mailto:melissa.hill@morganlewis.com)  
9 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP**  
10 101 Park Avenue  
11 New York, NY 10178  
12 Tel: 212.309.6000

13 Sean K. McMahan (*pro hac vice*)  
14 [sean.mcmahan@morganlewis.com](mailto:sean.mcmahan@morganlewis.com)  
15 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP**  
16 1717 Main Street, Suite 3200  
17 Dallas, TX 75201-7347  
18 Tel: 214.466.4000

19 Jared R. Killeen (*pro hac vice*)  
20 [jared.killeen@morganlewis.com](mailto:jared.killeen@morganlewis.com)  
21 **MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP**  
22 2222 Market Street  
23 Philadelphia, PA 19103  
24 Tel: 215.963.5000

25 *Attorneys for Defendants X Corp., f/k/a*  
26 *Twitter, Inc.; X Holdings; Elon Musk; and*  
27 *Does*

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

COURTNEY MCMILLIAN and RONALD  
COOPER

Plaintiffs,

v.

X CORP., f/k/a/ TWITTER, INC., X  
HOLDINGS, ELON MUSK, Does,

Defendants

Case No. 3:23-cv-03461-TLT-RMI

**DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO STAY DISCOVERY  
PENDING RESOLUTION OF  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

Judge: Trina L. Thompson  
Magistrate Judge: Robert M. Illman

## **ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION**

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 16-2(d), and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c), Defendants X Corp. (formerly known as “Twitter”), X Holdings Corp., and Elon Musk (collectively, “Defendants”) respectfully request an order staying discovery pending a final disposition on Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint (Dkt. 38 (the “Motion” or “Mot.”)).

## **BACKGROUND**

Plaintiffs Courtney McMillian and Robert Cooper (“Plaintiffs”) filed their Amended Complaint on October 13, 2023 (Dkt. 13 (“Amended Complaint” or “Am. Compl.”)), asserting claims under the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (“ERISA”), 29 U.S.C. §§ 1001-1461. Plaintiffs allege Defendants maintained a so-called “Twitter Severance Plan,” an employee welfare benefit plan as defined in ERISA Section 3(1)(A), 29 U.S.C. § 1002(1)(A), but failed to provide participants with benefits purportedly owed under the plan. Plaintiffs also allege Defendants failed to adequately fund the alleged severance plan in violation of their fiduciary duties under ERISA Section 409, 29 U.S.C. § 1109, and Section 502(a)(2), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(2), and seek “equitable” relief under ERISA Section 502(a)(3), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(3), based on allegations that Defendants made misrepresentations and failed to disclose information about the alleged severance plan to participants.

On January 9, 2024, Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss on the basis that (i) Plaintiffs failed to plausibly allege the existence of a “Twitter Severance Plan,” (ii) there is no duty under ERISA to fund an employee welfare benefit plan (even if such a plan existed here), and (iii) Plaintiffs cannot obtain equitable relief under Section 502(a)(3) that is duplicative of the relief they seek under ERISA Sections 502(a)(1)(B) and 502(a)(2). Plaintiffs filed their opposition to the Motion to Dismiss on February 9, 2024 (Dkt. 45), and Defendants filed their reply on February 23, 2024 (Dkt. 50). The Court scheduled a hearing on Defendants’ Motion for April 9, 2024. Dkt. 38.

On March 7, 2024, the parties submitted a Joint Case Management Statement setting forth their positions on various subjects including discovery. Dkt. 56. In the Joint Case Management Statement, Defendants proposed the Court stay discovery pending the resolution of Defendants’

1 Motion to Dismiss, while Plaintiffs opposed such a stay. On March 14, 2024, the Court held a case  
 2 management conference and informed Defendants they should submit a formal motion to stay  
 3 discovery to the magistrate judge assigned to this case. Dkt. 57. The Court entered a Case  
 4 Management and Scheduling Order setting the fact discovery cut-off on March 15, 2025. Dkt. 58.

### 5 ARGUMENT

#### 6 **I. Courts Have Broad Discretion to Stay Discovery Pending Resolution of a Dispositive** 7 **Motion**

8 “A district court has broad discretion to stay discovery pending the disposition of a  
 9 dispositive motion.” *Little v. City of Seattle*, 863 F.2d 681, 685 (9th Cir. 1988); *Hall v. Tilton*, 2010  
 10 WL 539679, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 9, 2010). Under Federal Rule 26(c), “[t]he court may, for good  
 11 cause, issue an order to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or  
 12 undue burden or expense[.]” *Arcell v. Google LLC*, 2022 WL 16557600, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 31,  
 13 2022) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1)).

14 Courts in this district apply a two-prong test to determine whether good cause exists to stay  
 15 discovery pending resolution of a dispositive motion. *Yamasaki v. Zicam LLC*, 2021 WL 3675214  
 16 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2021). “First, the moving party must demonstrate that the pending motion is  
 17 potentially dispositive of the entire case, or at least dispositive on the issue at which discovery is  
 18 directed.” *Id.* at \*1 (citation omitted). “Second, the court must determine whether the pending  
 19 motion can be decided absent discovery.” *Id.* (citation omitted). Courts routinely grant motions to  
 20 stay where the two-factor test is satisfied, as it is here. *See, e.g., Nelson v. F. Hoffmann-La Roche,*  
 21 *Inc.*, 2022 WL 19765995, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2022) (J. Thompson) (granting motion to stay  
 22 where motion to dismiss was “potentially dispositive of the entire case” and discovery was  
 23 unnecessary for resolution of the motion); *Azuga, Inc., v. Fleet Connect Solutions, LLC*, 22-cv-  
 24 04790-TLT, ECF No. 44 (N.D. Cal. March 14, 2023) (J., Thompson) (same); *Stebbins v. Google*  
 25 *LLC*, 23-cv-00322-TLT, ECF No. 47 (N.C. Cal. Apr. 3, 2023) (J. Thompson) (same); *Hamilton v.*  
 26 *Rhoads*, 2011 WL 5085504, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2011) (same); *Arcell*, 2022 WL 16557600,  
 27 at \*2 (same); *Yamasaki*, 2021 WL 3675214, at \*2 (same); *Hall*, 2010 WL 539679, at \*2 (same);  
 28 *Cal. Crane Sch., Inc. v. Google LLC*, 2022 WL 1271010, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2022) (same).

## II. The Two-Factor Test for Staying Discovery Is Satisfied Here

The first factor is satisfied because Defendants' Motion, if granted, will dispose of the entirety of the case. To satisfy this factor, Defendants need not show that they will prevail on their Motion or that the Motion will necessarily dispose of Plaintiffs' claims. Instead, Defendants need only show "it is possible that defendants' motion to dismiss could be dispositive of the entire case." *Nelson*, 2022 WL 19765995, at \*1. That is true here.

Defendants' Motion argues that Plaintiffs' claims are premised on the implausible assumption that Defendants maintained a secret ERISA severance plan. Mot. 4-7. As explained in the Motion, Plaintiffs' denial-of-benefits claim fails because the Amended Complaint does not allege any severance payments made by Twitter necessitated "an ongoing administrative scheme" that would constitute a plan under ERISA. *Id.* 5-6. Plaintiffs' claim also defies common sense and the public record because Plaintiffs identify no governing plan documents, no summary plan descriptions, no formal benefits statements, and no plan-related public filings with the Department of Labor or Internal Revenue Service that are the hallmarks of any ERISA plan. *Id.* at 6-7. The Motion also explains that Plaintiffs' fiduciary-breach claim fails because even if Twitter maintained a severance "plan" that provided former employees with severance benefits, ERISA does not require Defendants to "fund" such a plan, and any decisions about a plan's funding would be non-fiduciary settlor activity for which Defendants are not liable under ERISA. *Id.* at 7-10. Finally, the Motion argues Plaintiffs' claim for equitable relief fails because the Ninth Circuit has held that a plaintiff may not seek equitable redress under Section 502(a)(3) where, as here, adequate relief is available under other sections of ERISA. Thus, "[a]t a minimum, defendants have established that their motion is 'potentially dispositive' of the entire case, which weighs in favor of granting a brief stay of discovery until the Court issues a ruling on defendants' motion to dismiss." *Nelson*, 2022 WL 19765995, at \*1.

The second factor is satisfied too because Defendants' Motion can be decided without further discovery. Indeed, Defendants' motion to dismiss "is based solely on the allegations in the complaint and does not raise any factual issues." *Nelson*, 2022 WL 19765995, at \*2. Nor does Defendants' Motion rely on a declaration that might require further discovery to allow Plaintiffs to

1 test the declaration’s accuracy. *C.f. LegalForce RAPC Worldwide, Inc. v. LegalOn Tech., Inc.*, 22-  
 2 cv-07627-TLT, ECF. No. 48 (N.D. Cal. April 23, 2023). Because Defendants rely on no facts,  
 3 documents, or declarations outside of the Amended Complaint, a stay is proper. *Pereda v. General*  
 4 *Motors LLC*, 2022 WL 19692037, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. March 15, 2022) (“The arguments raised in the  
 5 motion to dismiss and opposition do not require discovery.”).

### 6 **III. All Other Relevant Considerations Favor a Stay**

7 In evaluating whether to stay discovery pending a dispositive motion, courts may also  
 8 consider (i) whether a stay will promote judicial economy and prevent undue burden and expense;  
 9 (ii) whether any party will be prejudiced by a stay; and (iii) whether a “preliminary peek” at the  
 10 pending motion suggests that it has merit. *See Arcell*, 2022 WL 16557600, at \*1; *Yamasaki*, 2021  
 11 WL 3675214, at \*2. Each of these considerations favors a stay here.

12 First, a stay will spare Defendants and the Court from devoting unnecessary time and  
 13 resources to this lawsuit. Courts in this district recognize that a discovery stay will “promote  
 14 efficiency and avoid undue burden to Defendants” where the discovery tends to be “broad, time-  
 15 consuming and expensive.” *Arcell*, 2022 WL 16557600, at \*1. That is the case here. Courts  
 16 recognize “the prospect of discovery in a suit claiming breach of fiduciary duty is ominous,  
 17 potentially exposing the ERISA fiduciary to probing and costly inquiries and document requests  
 18 about its methods and knowledge at the relevant times.” *Pension Ben. Guar. Corp. ex rel. St.*  
 19 *Vincent Catholic Med. Ret. Plan*, 712 F.3d 705, 719 (2d Cir. 2013). This burden “elevates the  
 20 possibility that a plaintiff with a largely groundless claim [will] simply take up the time of a number  
 21 of other people, with the right to do so representing an *in terrorem* increment of the settlement  
 22 value, rather than a reasonably founded hope that the discovery process will reveal relevant  
 23 evidence.” *Id.* And that certainly holds true here, where Plaintiffs’ portion of the Joint Case  
 24 Management Statement and Plaintiffs’ Rule 26(a) Initial Disclosures make clear Plaintiffs will seek  
 25 broad, burdensome, and costly discovery, including testimony from 25 potential witnesses  
 26 concerning numerous “subjects” and “time periods” related to the Twitter-X Corp. merger in late  
 27 2022, and the company’s severance practices before, during, and after the merger. *See* Dkt. 56, at  
 28 11-14. *See Tradin Organics USA LLC v. Terra Nostra Organics, LLC*, 2023 WL 8481814, at \*2

(N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2023) (stay appropriate where plaintiffs “look like they seek permission to conduct a fishing expedition”).

Second, the Court scheduled an April 9, 2024, hearing on the Motion to Dismiss, and will issue a decision shortly thereafter. There is little risk of prejudice to the opposing party where, as here, the motion briefing is completed and the parties will present their positions to the Court in the near future. *See, e.g., Yamasaki*, 2021 WL 3675214, at \*2 (“The Court also notes that the pending motion to dismiss will be fully briefed next month, and can be decided without additional discovery. There is therefore minimal risk of prejudice to either party.”); *In re Nexus 6p Prods. Liability Litig.*, 2017 WL 3581188, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 18, 2017) (“limited stay of discovery does not unduly prejudice Plaintiffs, and allows all parties to commence discovery with a better understanding of which claims, if any, they must answer”); *Reveal Chat Holdco, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.*, 2020 WL 2843369, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 10, 2020) (“To put this limited stay in context, discovery will be stayed for approximately two months until the motion to dismiss hearing.... This limited stay of discovery, therefore, does not unduly prejudice Plaintiffs and allows all parties to commence discovery with a better understanding of which claims, if any, they must answer.”).

Finally, a “preliminary peek” at the Motion to Dismiss shows that Defendants’ defenses are strong. *See Yamasaki*, 2021 WL 3675214, at \*2 (granting stay where “Defendant’s motion to dismiss presents strong arguments that Plaintiff’s causes of action” were meritless). As explained in the Motion, the Amended Complaint fails to state a claim for many reasons. Not only do Plaintiffs fail to plausibly show that a “Twitter Severance Plan” existed, but they do not plausibly allege that Defendants breached any duties under ERISA in administering such a plan.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court stay discovery pending a disposition on Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss.

1 Dated: March 22, 2024

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

2  
3 By /s/ Melissa Hill

4 Melissa Hill (*pro hac vice*)

5 Mark Feller

6 Sean McMahan (*pro hac vice*)

7 Jared R. Killeen (*pro hac vice*)

8 Attorneys for Defendants  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28